

## Variations of Possessive *Have*\*

Shiro Takeuchi

### 1. Introduction

This paper deals with possessive *have* (henceforth, PH), exemplified in (1):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. I have a house.  
 b. I have a sister.  
 c. The house has three bedrooms.

In (1a), *I* is interpreted as having an ownership of *a house*; in (1b), *I* and *a sister* are in a kinship relation; and in (1c), there is a part-whole relation of *three bedrooms* and *the house*. Here, I use the word *Possessive* as a cover term for these relations (Brugman (1988), and Hayase (1993)).

PH has the syntactic form [NP1 HAVE NP2], which is confirmed by the following:

- (2) a. I have a house (in a New York suburb).  
 b. I have a sister (in Texas).  
 c. The house has three bedrooms (at the front) and two (at the back).

When a PP appears in the sentences in (1) as in (2), it is deletable, which means that it is not subcategorized, suggesting that the construction [NP1 HAVE NP2] is necessary and sufficient in order to express a possessive relation of NP1 to NP2 (Belvin (1993), Ritter and Rosen (1997), and Nakau (1998)).

This leads us to assume that sentences like those in (3) are also instances of PH, since they have the same form.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* This is a revised and extended version of Takeuchi (2011). I would like to thank the following people for giving me helpful and encouraging comments: Yukio Hirose, Nobuhiro Kaga, Masaharu Shimada, Naoaki Wada, Masato Takiura, Minoru Nakau, and Ken-ichi Kitahara. My gratitude also goes to Shun Kudo, Kazuya Nishimaki, Masaki Yasuhara, and Daichi Watanabe. I am also indebted to Chris McVay and Nicholas Wood for kindly and patiently acting as informants. All remaining errors and inadequacies are of course my own.

<sup>1</sup> There are many different *have* constructions in English such existential, exemplified in (i), and causative, exemplified in (ii):

- (i) The table has a book on it.  
 (ii) John had three students read the article.

In sentence (i), the spatial location of *a book* on *the table* is expressed; and in sentence (ii), *John* caused *three students* to read a particular article.

<sup>2</sup> *GoodFellas* is a movie produced in 1990 starring Robert De Niro.

- (3) a. This country has its exiles. (BNC, with slight modifications)  
 b. GoodFellas has its problems. (BNC)

In addition, in (3a), there is a part-whole relation between *exiles* and *this country*; in (3b), the same kind of relation holds between *problems* and *GoodFellas*, indicating further that they are instances of PH.

Symptomatic of these sentences is that a genitive coreferential with NP1, namely *its*, appears within NP2. Henceforth, I call the form [X HAVE X'S Y] exemplified in (3) Type 2 and the form [X HAVE Y], where there is no genitive coreferential with NP1, exemplified in (1), Type 1. As is shown in (4), instances of Type 2 can change into those of Type 1:

- (4) a. This country has exiles.  
 b. GoodFellas has problems.

As is clear in (5) and (6), however, instances of Type 1 cannot always be instances of Type 2:

- (5) a. This suitcase has a lock.  
 b. This cell has a bed.  
 (6) a. # This suitcase has its lock.  
 b. # This cell has its bed.

The sentences in (5) instantiate Type 1. As shown in (6), when a genitive coreferential with NP1 appears within NP2, they are judged nonsensical. This phenomenon indicates the existence of a licensing condition for Type 2.

Another point that is worth stating here is that examples of Type 2 are numerous where a quantifier like *every* or *each* appears within NP1, as exemplified below:

- (7) a. Each of these systems has its advantages and disadvantages. (OALD<sup>7</sup>)  
 b. Everything has its time. [Proverb]

The reason for the affinity of them for Type 2 will be accounted for by considering the function that Type 2 internalizes.

The aim of this paper is mainly to clarify (i) the licensing condition of the form [X HAVE X'S Y] (Type 2) and (ii) the function that it internalizes and to assert (iii) that the former is a requirement of the latter.

Furthermore, to analyze Type 2 better, I will also compare it with the forms [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] (henceforth, Type 3), shown in (8a), and [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN] (henceforth, Type 4), shown in (8b):

- (8) a. Each resort has its own character. (BNC, with slight modifications)  
 b. You have enough worries of your own. (R. Carson, *Love affair*)

In (8a), the word *own* appears within NP2; in (8b), *of* appears within NP2 and *x's own* is postposed to it. The comparison of these Types and Type 1 with Type 2 leads to a more accurate analysis of the latter, and to revealing the existence of a hierarchy in licensing the four, as shown in (9):

- (9) i. [X HAVE Y] < ii. [X HAVE X'S Y] ≤ iii. [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] = iiib. [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN]

While the four forms differ in their complexity of the internal structure of NP2, they all instantiate the construction [NP1 HAVE NP2], which expresses a possessive relation between NP1 and NP2. Therefore, this paper is to be regarded as one of the attempts of examining variations of PH.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. Previous Studies

Although there have been a lot of studies on *have* constructions in English, including several doctoral dissertations (Belvin (1996), Costa (1974), Lizotte (1983) among others), to the best of my knowledge, Type 2 has never been analyzed in detail. Neither do reference books such as Huddleston and Pullum (2002) and Quirk et al. (1985) investigate it. Although Brugman (1988:183) solely takes up Type 2 and presents an intuitive interpretation of it, she examines neither its nature nor its licensing condition.

- (10) a. She has many friends.  
 b. She has her many friends.

Brugman offers sentences (10) and notes that relative to sentence (10a), sentence (10b) has a “strict possessive interpretation”; however, she says nothing as to what it really means. In section 3, considering the nature and the function of Type 2, I

---

<sup>3</sup> The distinction generally made concerning PH is whether or not the relation between NP1 and NP2 is cancelable. When it is, the relation is called alienable, and when it is not, the relation is called inalienable. While the discussion here continues based on instances of inalienable possession, it equally applies to instances of alienable possession, which I will take up in section 6.

will attempt to discern what Brugman would like to say.

### 3. [X HAVE X'S Y]

I clarify the licensing condition of Type 2 in subsection 3.1. and examine the function that Type 2 internalizes in subsection 3.2., leading to the assertion that the former is a requirement of the latter.

#### 3.1. *Licensing Condition*

The licensing condition of Type 2 involves the relation between the value of X and that of Y, namely the degree of necessity of the latter to the former.

Let us begin with the following minimal pair:

- (11) a. # This house has its bedroom.  
 b. This house has its bomb shelter.

(11a), an infelicitous example, and (11b), a felicitous one, differ only in the value of Y, which is *bedroom* in the former and *bomb shelter* in the latter. Since the syntactic structure and the value of X are the same, it follows that the felicitousness of the use of the form depends on the value of Y. Note here that there is a palpable difference in the degree of necessity of *bedroom* and *bomb shelter* to *house*.<sup>4</sup> Whereas not having a bedroom can exclude categorization as a house, not having a bomb shelter cannot. In other words, while a bedroom is thought to be indispensable to a house, a bomb shelter is not (Cruse (1986:15-20)). Thus it is safe to say that the felicitousness of the use of Type 2 depends on semantic and/or pragmatic relation between the values X and Y.

Bearing this in mind, let us examine the following examples:

- (12) a. # This suitcase has its lock. (= (6a))  
 b. # This cell has its bed. (= (6b))  
 c. # This table has its four legs.  
 d. # This computer has its screen.
- (13) a. This country has its exiles. (= (3a))  
 b. GoodFellas has its problems. (= (3b))  
 c. His passion has its drawbacks. (BNC, with slight modifications)  
 d. The Senate has its uses. (R. Scott, *the Gladiator*)

In each sentence in (12), the value of Y can be thought of as one of the criterial

---

<sup>4</sup> I owe this observation to Kazuhiko Tanaka (p.c.).

components shared by members of the category to which the value of X belongs. That is, taking (12d) for example, the lack of a screen can exclude categorization as a computer; a computer without it is of little use. On the other hand, in each sentence in (13), the value of Y does not seem to be indispensable to the category of which the value of X is a member. In (13a), for instance, having exiles is merely a possible component of a country; a country where there are no exiles is still a country.

On the basis of the discussion so far, I present the following hypothesis:

- (14) Type 2 is licensed if the value of Y is not regarded as one of the indispensable components of members of the category to which the value of X belongs.

Now, let us verify the validity of this hypothesis. In the pairs of sentences in (15-17), the value of X is the same while that of Y is not. In (a), the value of Y is one of the requisites for members of the category to which the value of X belongs; in (b), it is not:

- (15) a. # This cell has its bed.  
       b. This cell has its shower.  
 (16) a. # This plane has its engines.  
       b. This plane has its advantages.  
 (17) a. # This book has its cover.  
       b. This book has its specially designed cover.

For example, in (17b), *cover* is modified by an adjective and can be considered special, which lessens its degree of necessity to categorization as a book.

Next, in (18) and (19), the value of the subject X is the same as that of (13a) and (13b) respectively. In each pair, the value of Y is thought to be indispensable to members of the category [COUNTRY] and [MOVIE] respectively. If the hypothesis is on the right track, the sentences are judged nonsensical. This expectation is borne out:

- (18) a. # This country has its government.  
       b. # This country has its Diet.  
 (19) a. # GoodFellas has its director.  
       b. # GoodFellas has its actor(s).

An informant reports, however, that the degree of inappropriateness of sentences (18) is lower than that of other infelicitous sentences. This can be accounted for as follows: the internal structure of members of the category [COUNTRY] is considered more complex than, for example, that of those of the category [HOUSE] or [BOOK]; therefore, it is more difficult to imagine components the absence of which leads to the exclusion from categorization as a country.

The following contrast indicates that different values of X mean different degree of necessity of the value of Y to it:

- (20) a. # Each house has its bathroom.  
 b. In this hotel, each bedroom has its bathroom.

While members of the category [HOUSE] are expected to have a bathroom as one of its necessary constituents, members of the category [BEDROOM IN A HOTEL] are not, confirming the validity of our hypothesis.

### 3.2. *Function*

In this subsection, let us examine two characteristics inherent in Type 2: the presupposition that the part [X'S Y] requires and the function that Type 2 internalizes.

The use of a genitive pronoun as in [X'S Y] requires [X HAVE Y] as a presupposition; therefore, the use of the form [X HAVE X'S Y] requires [X HAVE Y] as a presupposition. Examine the following:

- (21) a. America has its problems.  
 b. America has problems.

Since X'S is bound by the value of the subject X, sentence (21a) requires sentence (21b) as a presupposition. In other words, the speaker presupposes [X HAVE Y] and utters [X HAVE X'S Y].

That X'S is a bound variable specifies the function that Type 2 internalizes. In (21a), *its* modifies *problems* and is bound by the subject *America*, meaning that only the value of the subject X, *America*, modifies the value of Y, *problems*. As a result, *problems* are construed as belonging only to *America*.

In Type 2, the value of the subject X and only this value modifies the value of Y. This means that when the value of X changes, the value that modifies the value of Y also changes. More specifically, the value of Y that is modified by X<sub>1</sub>, for example, belongs only to it and that of Y modified by X<sub>2</sub> belongs only to it.

This enables the contrast between *America* and *France* in (22b).<sup>5</sup>

- (22) a. America has problems and France has problems.  
 b. America has its problems and France has its problems.

In (22a), *America* and *France* are not contrasted; sentence (22a) is merely a statement that both countries have problems. On the other hand, in (22b), the two countries can be contrasted, since having problems of its own makes each country different from the other and the difference between them makes the contrast possible.<sup>6</sup>

This is confirmed by the contrast below:

- (23) a. # While America has problems, France has problems.  
 b. While America has its problems, France has its problems.

As shown in (23), while the word *while*, which shows that two sentences are in contrast, cannot appear in (22a), it can in (22b). As is clear in (23a), since the form which does not include X'S does not internalize the function of contrasting members of a category, it is inherent to Type 2, which includes X'S.

So far, we have seen that Type 2 (i) requires [X HAVE Y] as a presupposition and (ii) internalizes the function that only the value of the subject X modifies the value of Y, which enables the latter to be considered belonging only to the former. In section 2, we quoted Brugman (1988) as saying that there was a "strict possessive interpretation" in an instance of Type 2. It seems to me that by using the word *strict*, Brugman wants to refer to the uniqueness of the value of Y to the value of X. It is these two characteristics that Type 2 has and Type 1 does not, and, as it were, what the former does is merely these two things.

The function just discussed is made the best of by quantifiers like *every* and *each*. Sentences like those in (24) and proverbs like those in (25) are numerous:

- (24) a. Everyone has his limitations. (E. Kazan, *Elia Kazan: a life*)  
 b. Every job has its difficulties and frustrations. (OALD<sup>7</sup>)  
 c. Each of these systems has its advantages and disadvantages. (= (7a))  
 d. Each marriage has its ups and downs.

<sup>5</sup> In (22a), it is better to add *also* or *too* in the second sentence; in either case, however, *America* and *France* are not contrasted.

<sup>6</sup> Here are similar examples:

- (i) a. History has its lessons and fiction has its. (Quirk et al. (1985:322))  
 b. Army has its distinct problems and Navy has its distinct problems. (*Hearings Vol. 1*)

(S. Moise, *Life Is Not a Fairy Tale, but...*)

- (25) a. Everything has its time. (= (7b))  
 b. Every medal has its reverse.  
 c. Every rose has its thorn.  
 d. Every tide has its ebb.  
 e. Every bullet has its billet.  
 f. Every dog has {his/its} day.  
 g. Every man has his price.  
 h. Every man has his humour.  
 i. Every man has his faults.  
 j. Every light has its shadow.  
 k. Every Jack has his Jill.  
 l. Every gap has its bush.  
 m. Every wood has its worm.  
 n. Every commodity has its incommodity.

These quantifiers refer to members of a category individually. Instances of Type 2 where this kind of quantifier appears within NP1 can state that each member of a category modified by it has the value of Y unique to it; as a result, the difference between members of the category is communicated.<sup>7,8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> There are similar examples found in French, which has “*avoir (have)*” and the similar system of personal pronouns:

- (i) a. *Chacun a ses faiblesses.*  
 Everyone has his/her (pl.) weaknesses.  
 ‘Everyone has his/her weaknesses.’  
 (ii) b. *Chaque âge a ses plaisirs.*  
 Each age has its (pl.) pleasures.  
 ‘Each age has its pleasures.’

These two sentences communicate the same kind of relation as that of the English sentences in (24) and (25).

<sup>8</sup> One might say that the sentence in (25b) constitutes a counterexample for our hypothesis in (14). However, note here that it is a proverb, and both *medal* and *reverse* are not interpreted literally but metaphorically. Consider the following:

- (i) Of course, the theological depth of the fourth Gospel has been the main reason for its success in the history of the Church. But this medal has its reverse as well. If the theological depth of St. John’s Gospel is no longer seen as a complement to the other gospels, as Aquinas sees it, the divinity of Christ will be separated from his humanity, and the theological tradition might become one-sided.

(M. Dauphinais, M. Levering, *Reading John with St. Thomas Aquinas: theological exegesis and speculative*, underlines mine)

As is clear in this example, *medal* and *reverse* have lost their literal meanings, and have acquired metaphorical meanings like *matter* and *dark side* or *limitation*, respectively. If so, the value of Y

Uttering sentence (24a), for example, the speaker presupposes that each member of the category [INDIVIDUAL] has limitations and asserts that those limitations are unique to him/her, that is, each member has limitations different from any other member's. I represent this as follows:

- (26)  $x_1$ 's limitations are unique to it and  $x_2$ 's limitations are unique to it  
and...and  $x_n$ 's limitations are unique to it.  
( $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  = a set of individuals)

Thus, Type 2 has a close affinity with these quantifiers, and this is the reason for the numerousness of examples of it.

While in (22b), (24), and (25), the object with which the value of the subject X is contrasted is explicit; in (27), on the other hand, it is implicit. The function of Type 2, however, remains the same.

- (27) a. This technique is useful, but it has its limitations. (OALD<sup>7</sup>)  
b. Bicycles are popular, but they have their limitations on a wet and windy day. (BNC)

In (27a) for example, *it* refers to *this technique* and therefore *limitations* is thought of as belonging only to it. Note that *this technique* is contrasted implicitly with other techniques and thus I represent the assertion as follows:

- (28) The limitations of this technique are unique to it.

Note that the sentences in (22b), (24), (25), and (27) are all felicitous even when X'S does not appear in them, in which case, however, they will merely state the possessive relation between X and Y. The more complex the internal structure of NP2 gets, the more information a form communicates.

Now that we have confirmed the function Type 2 internalizes, let us assert that this function requires that the licensing condition should be as in (14). Consider the following:

- (29) a. # This book has its cover. (= (17a))  
b. This book has its specially designed cover. (= (17b))

---

is not regarded as indispensable to the value of X. Thus, I conclude that the proverb in (25b) and the others in (25) do not work against the hypothesis in (14).

Instances of Type 2 are judged infelicitous when the value of Y is thought of as one of the indispensable components of members of the category to which the value of X belongs. In this form, the value of Y is regarded as belonging only to the value of X. Having a cover is indispensable to any member of the category [BOOK]. That is to say, any book has a cover and by its very nature, that cover belongs only to the book to which it is attached. As is clear from this, it is normal that anything indispensable to members of a category should belong to each member of the category. To assert what is taken for granted is nonsensical and superfluous, hence the infelicity of sentences like those in (29a). On the other hand, as is shown in (29b), characteristics not indispensable to members of a category are not expected to belong to each member of the category. The use of this particular form is thus motivated.

This point of view enables us to account for easily why it is that the sentences in (30) are distinctly odd.

- (30) a. # This plane has its four engines.  
 b. # This house has its three bedrooms.

Neither having four engines nor three bedrooms is indispensable to members of the category [PLANE] and [HOUSE] respectively. However, from the very nature of things, when a plane has engines, they belong only to it; when a house has bedrooms, they belong only to it. Accordingly, there is no need to go to the expense of asserting it. It is not the number that counts, but whether or not the value of Y being unique to the value of X is considered to be normal.

The contrast we saw before also serves as evidence of the validity of this idea.

- (31) a. # Each house has its bathroom. (= (20a))  
 b. In this hotel, each bedroom has its bathroom. (= (20b))

While it is normal for members of the category [HOUSE] to have bathrooms, it is not for those of the category [BEDROOM IN A HOTEL]; therefore, the use of Type 2 is motivated.

On the basis of these observations, I conclude that the licensing condition of Type 2 is a requirement of its function.

#### 4. [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] and [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN]

##### 4.1. [X HAVE X'S OWN Y]

###### 4.1.1. *What Own Communicates*

So far, we have seen that in the form [X HAVE X'S Y] (Type 2), the value of Y is regarded as belonging only to the value of X. In English, there is the word OWN, which intensifies this uniqueness and makes it explicit, and the form [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] (Type 3), as exemplified in (32). Here, I compare these two types and revise a part of the discussion in section 3.2.

- (32) a. Each resort has its own character. (= (8a))  
 b. Each party has its own strategy for building a strong economy. (OCD)

Let us consider the word OWN.

- (33) This book doesn't belong to the library – it's my own copy.  
[mine and nobody else's]  
 ((Quirk et al. (1985:362)) underlines mine)

As the underlined expression shows, by making the word OWN explicit, that *copy* belongs exclusively to the referent of *my* is communicated. Thus, as shown in (34), when one wants to show without any misunderstanding that a facility has equipment exclusively belonging to it and to intensify it, the use of the word is preferred.<sup>9</sup>

- (34) a. The White House has its \*(own) swimming pool, bowling alley, and movie theater.  
 b. The hotel has its \*(own) swimming pool, bar, cocktail lounge, dining room and gift shop.

Bearing this in mind, let us examine the difference in the interpretation between Types 2 and 3.

- (35) a. Everyone has his limitations.  
 b. Everyone has his own limitations.

While in (35a), it is possible that limitations of an individual are in some way or other similar to those of others; in (35b), on the other hand, such a possibility is totally excluded. In this way, the word OWN has the function of intensifying the uniqueness of Y to X and making it explicit.

On the basis of this observation, I represent the assertion of (35a) and (35b) as

---

<sup>9</sup> Sentences (34) are from K. Kenah, *Amazing Creations*, and E. Fodor, *Hawaii*, respectively. The asterisks and brackets are mine.

(36) and (37) respectively ((36) is a revised version of (26)).

(36) Certain of  $x_1$ 's limitations are different from those of other  $x$ s' and certain of  $x_2$ 's limitations are different from those of other  $x$ s' and...and certain of  $x_n$ 's limitations are different from those of other  $x$ s'.

( $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  = a set of individuals)

(37)  $x_1$ 's limitations are unique to it and  $x_2$ 's limitations are unique to it and...and  $x_n$ 's limitations are unique to it.

( $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  = a set of individuals)

I also revise the assertion of (27a) presented in (28) as follows:

(38) Certain of the limitations of this technique are different from those of other techniques'.

Again, the amount of information communicated increases in proportion to the complexity of the internal structure of NP2.

As we have seen, the word OWN intensifies the uniqueness of the value of Y to the value of X and makes it explicit. Stated differently, this means that it is appropriate for the word to appear in NP2 if and only if one can intensify its uniqueness, which we will examine next.

#### 4.1.2. *Difference in Acceptability*

When OWN is made explicit in NP2, the value of Y is construed as belonging exclusively to the value of X.

There are certain values that do appear as the value of Y in Type 2, but tend not to as that in Type 3. Consider the following:

(39) a. This country has its exiles. (= (13a))

b. # This country has its own exiles.

(40) a. America has its racists. (BNC, with slight modifications)

b. # America has its own racists.

An informant reports that *exiles* and *racists* are considered not so unique as to make OWN explicit. This is perhaps because one finds it difficult to imagine that exiles or racists in one country are totally different from those in other countries and have nothing in common.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> There are native speakers of English who regard sentences (39b) and (40b) as acceptable.

Accordingly, values that are construed easily as belonging exclusively to each member of the category [COUNTRY] do appear in the form [X HAVE X'S OWN Y], as shown in the following:

- (41) a. Each country has its own customs. (SEC3)  
 b. # Each country has its own {racists / exiles}.

Different countries mean different customs, and customs in one country can be totally different from those in other countries, the construal of which kind makes sentence (41a) felicitous.

It follows from the discussion here that to make OWN explicit or not is a reflection of whether the speaker can find the uniqueness of the value of Y to the value of X.<sup>11</sup>

#### 4.2. [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN]

Last but not least, let us examine sentences like those in (42) where OF appears and the part [X'S OWN] is postposed to Y.

- (42) a. You have enough worries of your own. (= (8b))  
 b. The European Council already has a life of its own. (BNC)

There is no difference in acceptability between [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] (Type 3) and [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN] (Type 4). As is shown in the pairs of sentences in (43) and (44), when the former form is judged acceptable, so is the latter; and when the former is judged unacceptable, so is the latter.

- (43) a. This technique has its own limitations. (*EMB magazine Vol. 19*)  
 b. This technique has limitations of its own.

---

Call these speaker A. Speaker A also regards as acceptable sentences (44b) and (48d) below. Those who consider (39b) and (40b) infelicitous, call these speaker B, consider these two infelicitous too. Note, however, that while speaker A construes (39a) and (40a) as acceptable without any effort, he/she needs some time to imagine a context in which (39b) or (40b) is uttered. In other words, while different speakers mean different acceptability, it is safe to say that (39b) and (40b) are difficult to accept relative to (39a) and (40a). I continue the discussion here on the basis of judgments of speaker B, which are harsher.

<sup>11</sup> The discussion so far enables us to answer why the word *own* does not appear in the proverbs in (25). Its absence does not guarantee that the value of Y is totally unique to the value of X, which makes it possible to express the difference and similarity of members of a category simultaneously. That members of a category have a similar characteristic leads to the comprehension that having a certain characteristic is universal among those members. Since proverbs give advice or says something that is generally true, they are consonant with not making use of the word *own*.

- (44) a. # This country has its own exiles. (= (39b))  
 b. # This country has exiles of its own.

That there is no difference in acceptability between these two forms suggests that there is little difference in interpretation between them.

One possible difference in interpretation between these two is reported by an informant. He says that there is an emotional nuance in Type 4, which is not present in Type 3. The parts [X'S (OWN) Y] and [Y OF X'S OWN] are what Taylor (1996:327-338) calls "the prenominal possessive" and "the postnominal possessive" respectively, and Taylor further notes that an emotional nuance may attach to the latter. In terms of this point, it might be possible to examine the difference in interpretation between the two Types. Due to limitation of space and time, however, I do not pursue this issue here.<sup>12</sup>

### 5 Acceptability between the Four Types

Finally, we examine the difference in acceptability between the four types we have been concerned with here and assert that there is a hierarchy in licensing them. Consider the sentences in (45) to (50):

- (45) a. This technique has limitations.  
 b. This technique has its limitations.  
 c. This technique has its own limitations. (= (43a))  
 d. This technique has limitations of its own.
- (46) a. GoodFellas has problems. (= (4b))  
 b. GoodFellas has its problems. (= (13b))  
 c. GoodFellas has its own problems.  
 d. GoodFellas has problems of its own.
- (47) a. This country has exiles. (= (4a))  
 b. This country has its exiles. (= (39a))  
 c. # This country has its own exiles. (= (44a))

---

<sup>12</sup> The difference between the form [X'S (OWN) Y] and the form [Y OF X'S OWN] may lie not so much in semantics as in syntax. Consider the following:

- (i) a. \*no its (own) problems  
 b. no problems of its own  
 (ii) a. \*those its (own) limitations  
 b. those limitations of its own

As is clear in (i) and (ii), since determiners like *no* and *those* cannot co-occur with a genitive, the use of the form [Y OF X'S OWN] is the only option available when one wants to use both a genitive and these kinds of determiners together. In other words, the use of these kinds motivates the use of the form, resulting in a subtle, if any, semantic difference between the forms.

- d. # This country has exiles of its own. (= (44b))
- (48) a. America has racists.  
 b. America has its racists. (= (40a))  
 c. # America has its own racists. (= (40b))  
 d. # America has racists of its own.
- (49) a. This plane has four engines.  
 b. # This plane has its four engines. (= (30a))  
 c. # This plane has its own four engines.  
 d. # This plane has four engines of its own.
- (50) a. This house has three bedrooms.  
 b. # This house has its three bedrooms. (= (30b))  
 c. # This house has its own three bedrooms.  
 d. # This house has three bedrooms of its own.

It follows from this overview that there is a hierarchy in licensing the four forms, as in (51). Because there is no difference in felicitousness between the Types 3 and 4, I represent them as *iiia* and *iiib* respectively.<sup>13</sup>

- (51) i. [X HAVE Y] < ii. [X HAVE X'S Y]  $\cong$  iii.a. [X HAVE X'S OWN Y] = iii.b. [X HAVE Y OF X'S OWN]  
 (= (9))

This hierarchy reads as follows: When a form situated higher on this hierarchy is felicitous, a form or forms situated lower is/are felicitous, but not vice versa.

Seeing that when *ii* is infelicitous, *iiia* and *iiib* are also infelicitous and that these three forms have X'S in common, it is reasonable to say that these forms constitute a smaller group. Furthermore, since the latter two have OWN in common and show no difference in acceptability, these two constitute a much smaller group. The relation between X and Y is crucial in dividing *i* and the other three, and whether or not the uniqueness of the value of Y to X is construable is crucial in dividing form *ii* and the forms *iiia* and *iiib*.

Form *i* expresses only a possessive relation of X to Y. As the internal structure of NP2 gets more complex, as a form is situated higher on the hierarchy in (51), more information gets communicated.

## 6. Conclusion

---

<sup>13</sup> As we saw in footnote 8, there is difference in acceptability between the forms *ii* and *iii*. The symbol  $\cong$  in (51) is a reflection of this subtle difference.

This paper dealt with mainly the form [X HAVE X'S Y], which has never been analyzed in detail, and clarified its licensing condition and its function, leading to the assertion that the former is a requirement of the latter. In addition, I proposed the existence of a hierarchy in licensing the four forms we have been concerned with here.

So far, we have discussed the four Types on the basis of examples of inalienable possession. One may have the impression that the discussion here only applies to these examples; however, it also applies to examples of alienable possession. Consider the following examples, each of which expresses this relation:

(52) Now you have your car and you're on your parent's insurance policy. The next thing you need is a credit card so you can establish your own credit.

(R. Milano, *The 10% Plan for Life*)

(53) "What, you have your own ship?" "I have my own ship," said Tabitha.

(BNC)

(54) I have a house of my own.

(Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons,  
*Reports from commissioners*)

In (52), the referent of *you* has a car belonging to him/her; in (53), the referent of *you* and *I* has a car exclusively belonging to him/her; and in (54), the referent of *I* has a house of his/her own. Since the subject referent is able to cancel the relation of him/her to the referent of NP2, all these relations are alienable, suggesting that our discussion here holds regardless of the alienability of the relation between NP1 and NP2.

#### REFERENCES

- Belvin, R. (1993) "The Two Causative *Haves* Are the Two Possessive *Haves*," *CLS* 29, 61-75.
- Belvin, R. (1996) "Inside Events: The Non-Possessive Meanings of Possession Predicates and the Semantic Conceptualization of Events," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California.
- British National Corpus* [BNC].
- Brugman, C. M. (1988) "The Syntax and Semantics of 'Have' and its Complements," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Costa, R. M. B. (1974) "A Generative Semantic Study of the Verb "*Have*"," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986) *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Hayase, N. (1993) "Prototypical Meaning vs. Semantic Constraints in the Analysis of English Possessive Genitives," *English Linguistics* 10, 133-159.
- Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lizotte, R. J. (1983) "Universals Concerning Existence, Possession, and Location Sentences," Ph.D. Dissertation, Brown University.
- Nakau, M. (1998) "Kuukan to Sonzai no Kouzu (Structure of Space and Existence)," *Koubun to Zisyoukouzou (Constructions and Event Structures)* M. Nakau and Y. Nishimura, 1-106, Kenkyuusha, Tokyo.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (7th edition) [OALD<sup>7</sup>], (2005) Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English* [OCD], (2002) Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman, London.
- Ritter, E. and S. T. Rosen. (1997) "The Function of *Have*," *Lingua* 101, 295-321.
- Sunshine English Course 3* [SEC3], (2006) KAIRYUDO Publishing Co., Ltd., Tokyo.
- Takeuchi, S. (2011) "Note on a Special Use of *Have* Constructions in English," *Tsukuba English Studies* 29, 231-240.
- Taylor, John R. (1996) *Possessives in English*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics  
 University of Tsukuba  
 e-mail: takeuchishiro@gmail.com